



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,737	02/24/2000	Daniel Yellin	P-5332-US	5521

27130 7590 08/21/2003

EITAN, PEARL, LATZER & COHEN ZEDEK LLP  
10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 1001  
NEW YORK, NY 10020

EXAMINER

MAI, TAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

19

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

19

DATE MAILED:

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tan Mai (PTO's Ex) (3) Moshe Veyh (Appl.'s Repr.)  
(2) Dekel Shiloh (Appl.'s Repr.) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview \_\_\_\_\_

Type:  Telephonic  Televideo Conference  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5

Identification of prior art discussed: van der Wal

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The discussion is 112 and 103 issues. Applicant's Repr. argue that the Spec. supports the claim invention (e.g., Page 3, lines 16-18, Page 7, lines 4-13). Examiner points out that the figure(s) do not show the support of "propagation of a value". Also, Applicant's Repr. argue that the rejection 103 is

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

*improper because Van der Wal can not combine with other references. The Examiner will consider the amendment. No agreement was reached during the interview.*